

INDEX

Note 1: This index focuses on legal issues and on the arbitral and judicial decisions under consideration. The summaries, parties' arguments, facts and ancillary documents are indexed only to the extent they are essential to an understanding of the legal issues. It has been designed in such a way as to be amenable to developing ICSID case law, so far as appropriate adopting the terminology of the index to C.H. Schreuer: *The ICSID Convention: A Commentary* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Note 2: For procedural points reference should be made to individual conventions by article and the various Rules headings. References are included under subject headings only where the point at issue is the subject of debate.

Note 3: References to cases are to discussion of those cases, not to the original report of the case.

Abbreviations used in the index

AR (Arbitration Rules)
 A&FR (Administrative and Financial Regulations)
 BITS (bilateral investment treaties)
 ECT (Energy Charter Treaty (1994))
 IBA (International Bar Association)
 ILC (International Law Commission)
 IR (ICSID Institution Rules)
 NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement (1994))
 PAP (Publications Assistance Program (Canada))
 PIA (Postal Imports Agreement)
 VCLT (Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties)

abuse of process, *Saipem* 383–4

abuse of rights

as exercise of right for purpose other than that intended 425
 as principle of international law 425
Saipem 422–5

ad hoc Committee (ICSID 52(3)): see annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52) (*ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 52(3)))

Administrative and Financial Regulations (A&FR)

14(3)(d) (tribunal costs) 656
 14(3)(e) (post-1984) (*ad hoc* Committee costs: annulment) 656
 25 (Secretary) 47, 107

admissibility and jurisdiction distinguished

ICSID 31–2, 367

jurisprudence

Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Congo v. Rwanda) 31–2
LESI–DIPENTA 367
Saipem 367
SGS v. Philippines 31–2
Telefónica 31–2

annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52) (*ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 52(3)))

constitution 327

partial annulment (ICSID 52(3)) 339–40

task/powers

annulment on grounds set out in ICSID 52, limitation to 332, 559–60, 601

jurisprudence reviewed 559–60

limitation to determination of compliance with procedures 632–3

annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52), grounds

failure to state reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e)) 562–4, 601–2, 648–55

failure to decide every question referred to Tribunal distinguished 334–5

failure to state any reasons, failure to state correct or convincing reasons distinguished 562–4

sufficiency to understand how tribunal arrived at its conclusion 653–4

improper constitution of Tribunal (ICSID 52(1)(a)) 622–35

“properly constituted” 631–2

limitation of Committee’s role to determination of compliance with procedures 632–3

ordinary meaning in the light of its object and purpose (VCLT 31(1)) 631

jurisprudence

AMCO I 591–2

AMCO II 591

Azurix: see *Azurix* (annulment)

CMS 561, 564, 591–2

ELSI 593–4

Helnan 329–43

Klöckner 339–40, 561, 568–9, 591

Lucchetti 561, 568–9, 591–2, 601–2

MINE 561–3, 591–2, 601–2

MTD 561–2, 591–2, 601–2

Repsol 561, 569, 591–2

Soufraki 336, 561, 568–9, 591–2

Vivendi 332, 336, 341, 562–4, 592–4, 601–2, 620

Wena Hotels 563, 601–2

manifest excess of power (ICSID 52(1)(b)) 561–2

absence of subject-matter or personal jurisdiction 561–2

agreement of parties/compromise as basis for determining 335–7

assumption of improper *ex aequo et bono* jurisdiction 591

competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID 41(1)) 568–9

failure to apply correct applicable law (ICSID 42(1)) 561, 591

erroneous application distinguished 561, 591–2

“manifest” 339, 562, 568–70

serious departure from fundamental rules of procedure (ICSID 52(1)(d)) 562, 604–12

failure to consider key arguments 620–1

failure to exercise discretionary power to order disclosure 613–20

failure to give parties chance to be heard 334–5

“serious” 562

substantially different result, need for 619–20

annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52) (ICSID Reports)

Azurix 546–658

Helnan 326–43

applicable law (arbitration including in particular ICSID 42(1))

- general rules and principles of international law 146–9
- ICSID Convention, BIT and applicable international law 594–601
- international law, role (ICSID Convention) 594
- jurisprudence
 - AMCO I* 591–2
 - AMCO II* 591
 - Azurix* 591–601
 - ELSI* 593–4
 - Klöckner* 591
 - Lucchetti* 591–2
 - MINE* 591–2
 - MTD* 591–2
 - Repsol* 591–2
 - Soufraki* 591–2
 - Vivendi* 592–4

arbitration clause/agreement, interpretation

- guidelines
 - ordinary meaning in absence of counter-indications 204
 - parties' intention 204–6
- jurisprudence
 - Amco* 138–40
 - Inceysa* 138–40
 - Telenor* 204–6

arbitrator, resignation

- reconstitution of tribunal following 215–16
- World Duty Free* tribunal 215

Argentina, economic crisis, measures to tackle 49–50**Argentina–Spain BIT (1991) by article**

- IV (fair and equitable treatment), text 32
- IV(2) (MFN treatment) 31–9
- X(3)(a) (18 months rule) 18–20, 31–9
- text 31

Argentina–US BIT (1991), extracts 53**Argentina–US BIT (1991) by article**

- I(1)(a) (“investment”) 571–84
 - “every kind of investment” 25–9
- I(1)(a)(ii) (“investment”: “company or shares of stock or other interests”) 571–84
- II(2)(c) (non-compliance with obligations) (umbrella clause) 65–76, 595
- IV(1) (prompt, adequate and effective compensation), text 646
- V (transfers) 79–80
- VII (dispute settlement clause), text 53, 73
- VII(1) (“investment dispute”) 73–5, 577
- VII(1)(a) (“investment dispute”: violation of investment agreement as) 75–6
- VII(2) (request for consultations and negotiations) 53, 54, 577
- VII(2)(a)(i) (submission to ICSID Arbitral Tribunal) 53
- VII(4)(a) (as consent to ICSID arbitration) 53
- VII(8) (“deemed to be an investment of nationals or companies of the other State”) 577–8
- XII(2) (taxation) 76
 - relationship with BIT II(2)(a) 79–80

Argentina–US BIT (1991) by article (*cont.*)

relationship with BIT IV 79–80
 text 76

Azurix (annulment) 546–658

Committee’s decision 658

costs 655–8

Centre/committee costs (A&FR 14(3)(e)) and costs of tribunal proceedings (A&FR 14 (3)(d)) distinguished 656

discretionary nature 655, 657

unsuccessful party to pay 657

grounds (failure to state reasons (ICSID 52(1)(e)))

applicable principles 601–2

application in *Azurix* 602–4

in relation to the determination of compensation/damages

claim 636

Committee’s conclusion 655

Committee’s views 648–55

parties’ arguments (applicant) 636–8

parties’ arguments (respondent) 638–41

Tribunal’s findings 641–4

review of the jurisprudence 562–4

grounds (improper constitution of Tribunal (ICSID 52(1)(a))) 622–35

alleged conflicts of interest 622

alleged reasons for lack of independence/impartiality 622–3

applicable principles 630–1

“properly constituted” 631–2

Committee’s conclusion 635

Committee’s views 633–5

Disqualification Decision 623–7

limitation of Committee’s role to determination of compliance with procedures 632–3

parties’ arguments

applicant 627–30

respondent 630–1

grounds (manifest excess of power (ICSID 52(1)(b)) (failure to apply correct applicable law (ICSID 42(1)))) 584–601

applicable principles 591–2

Committee’s views 592–601

exceptio non adimpleti contractus principle 597–600

ICSID Convention, BIT and applicable international law as applicable law 594–601

summary of Tribunal’s decision 592

Vivendi 592–4

parties’ arguments

applicant 585–8

respondent 588–91

in relation to the determination of compensation

Committee’s conclusion 647

Committee’s views 644–7

parties’ arguments (applicant) 635

grounds (manifest excess of power (ICSID 52(1)(b)) (standing/derivative claims))

Committee’s analysis and conclusions

- ABA investment as “investment” of Azurix (BIT 1(1)(a)(ii)) 571–84
- BIT protection of interest other than ownership or contractual 578–80
- BIT VII(8)/ICSID 25(2)(b), relevance 577–8
- competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID 41 (1)) 569
- “investment dispute” (BIT VII(1)) 577
- “manifest” 568–70
- “national or company concerned” (BIT VII(2) and VII(3)) 577
- review of the jurisprudence/standard of review 561–2, 568–70
- risk of double recovery 580–2
- risk of forum selection clause circumvention 582
- risk of multiple claims (ICSID 25(2)(b)) 581–2
- summary of Azurix’s claims and Tribunal’s findings 570–1
- parties’ arguments
 - applicant 565–6, 573–4, 578
 - respondent 566–8
- Tribunal’s decision 564
- grounds (serious departure from fundamental rules of procedure (ICSID 52(1)(d)) (power to order disclosure))
 - Committee’s conclusion 622
 - Committee’s views 613–20
 - alleged conflicts of interest 635
 - applicable law 615
 - burden of proof (*onus probandi actori incumbit*) 614
 - discretionary nature of Tribunal’s power 613–17
 - equality of parties 613–19
 - failure to consider key arguments 620–1
 - substantially different result, need for 619–20
 - review of the jurisprudence 562
 - review of Tribunal proceedings 604–12
- interpretation of BIT/treaties (VCLT)
 - applicant’s arguments 573–4
 - Barcelona Traction* 573–4
 - Diallo* 575
 - interrelationship between treaties and customary international law 573–5
 - ordinary meaning of “investment” (VCLT 31) 576
 - supplementary means (VCLT 32), in absence of ambiguity/lack of effect 582–4
 - travaux préparatoires*/supplementary means, to avoid manifestly absurd or unreasonable result 580–2
 - VCLT as customary international law at time of conclusion of treaty 572–3
- procedural history 552–5
 - continued stay of enforcement 553–4
 - jurisdiction phase 558
 - merits phase 558–9
 - summary of dispute 555
- task/powers of Committee 559–60, 601, 632–3, 653–4
- Azurix (stay of enforcement)** 536–46
 - Committee’s decision 546
 - Committee’s views including need for security 542–6
 - parties’ arguments

Azurix (stay of enforcement) (cont.)

- applicant 536–7
- respondent 539–40
- procedural background 536–7
 - comfort letter 540
 - request for continued stay of enforcement 553–4
- relevant ICSID Convention and Arbitration Rules provisions (text) 541–2

Bangladesh–Italy BIT (1990) by article

- 1(1) (“investment”)
 - “as any kind of property”, limitation to “property”, effect 368, 376–7
 - “in conformity with the laws of the latter” 367
 - text 376
- 1(1)(c) (“credit for sums of money”) 377
- 5 (nationalization/expropriation) 360, 377–9, 416–30
 - text 375
- 5(1)(1) (“save by judgments or orders issued by courts”) 379–80
- 5(1)(3) (just compensation) 430–4
 - text 430–1
- 5(2) (expropriation: requirements) 417–19
 - “measure having similar effect” 418
- 9 (arbitration clause) 366, 375–82
 - fair and equitable treatment, exclusion 416–17
 - text 375

BITs (bilateral investment treaties)

- 18 months rule 18–20, 31–9
- breach of investment contract as breach of 305–6
- interpretation
 - international law vs law of host State 368, 376–7
 - treaty interpretation principles vs investor protection policy considerations 204–5

bribery/corruption

- international public policy and 241
- jurisprudence
 - European Gas Turbines SA v. Westman International* 241–3
 - Frontier AG and Brunner Sociedade* 243–5
 - ICC Case No 1110* (Judge Gunnar Lagergren’s Award) 243, 245
 - ICC Case No 3913* 244
 - ICC Case No 3916* 245
 - ICC Case No 8891* 245
 - Loewe* 244
 - OTV v. Hilmarton* 244–5
 - Westacre* 245
 - Westinghouse* 243–4
 - World Duty Free*, 235–56: *see also* *World Duty Free* (Perfume Contract claims)
- treaties and other international instruments relating to in date order
 - Inter-American Convention against Corruption (1996) 241
 - UN Declaration against Corruption and Bribery in International Commercial Transactions (1996) 242
 - OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions (1997) and Protocol (2003) 241

- Council of Europe Civil Law Convention on Corruption (1999) 241
- Council of Europe Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (1999) 241
- African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption (2003) 241–2
- UN Convention against Corruption (2003) 242

Bulgaria

- misrepresentation: *see Plama* (Award)
- Privatization Act, s 5(1) (misrepresentation) 687
- Roads Act (“republican roads”) 720

burden/standard of proof

- claimant (*onus probandi actori incumbit*)
 - general principle of international law 614
 - jurisprudence
 - Avena* 415
 - Azurix* 614
 - Feldman* 415
 - Fisheries Jurisdiction* 369–70
 - Mavrommatis* 369–70
 - Saipem* 368–9, 415
 - Soufraki* 415
 - Thunderbird* 415
 - Tradex* 415
 - UPS* 469, 474
 - national treatment (NAFTA 1102) 469, 474

compensation (expropriation/nationalization): *see* measure of compensation/valuation of company (with particular reference to expropriation claims)

compétence de la compétence: *see also* jurisdiction (ICSID), competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID 41(1))

domestic courts, *prima facie* jurisdiction, determination of and 56

confidentiality of arbitral proceedings, provisional measures (prohibition of information concerning case) 216–17

consent to ICSID jurisdiction

BIT provisions, interrelationship with ICSID jurisdiction provisions 134–7

good faith interpretation 139

jurisprudence

- Impregilo* 366
- Inceysa* 134–40
- Saipem* 366

legislation as 164–8

requirements

- clear and unequivocal consent 163–8
- written consent, consent in BIT coupled with arbitration request, sufficiency 366
- unilateral withdrawal, exclusion (ICSID 25(1)) 135–6

consultation or negotiation/exhaustion of alternative methods obligation: *see also* Argentina–US BIT (1991) by article, VII(2) (request for consultations and negotiations)

consultation period, elapse as condition precedent 54

contract, validity/voidability: *see also* bribery/corruption

avoidance, requirements 255–6

balancing the public policy burden 252–4

contract, validity/voidability (*cont.*)

separability of contract 252
 loss, relevance 251–2

corporation, legal personality, jurisprudence, *Barcelona Traction* 28, 95–6, 573–4**costs (ICSID *ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 61(2) and 52(4)))**

Centre/committee costs (A&FR 14(3)(e))
 costs of tribunal proceedings (A&FR 14(3)(d)) distinguished 656
 loser pays principle 657

discretionary nature 655, 657

jurisprudence

Azurix 655–8
CDC 655–7
CMS 655–6
Helnan 343
Lucchetti 655–6
Malaysian Historical Salvors 655–6
MTD 655–7
Repsol 655–7
Soufraki 655–7
Wena Hotels 657

parties' costs 657–8

costs (ICSID arbitral tribunal: ICSID 61(2))

Note: decisions relating to costs are indexed only if there is discussion of principle or a departure from usual practice

arbitration/tribunal costs

equal division 256, 325
 unsuccessful party/loser pays principle 207–8

discretion of tribunal 325

jurisprudence

Helnan 288, 325
Inceysa 168–9
Plama 724–6
Saipem 434
Telenor 207–8

parties

parties to bear own 325
 impropriety on part of both parties 168–9, 256

State party to pay claimant's unnecessary extra costs (ICSID arbitral tribunal: ICSID 61(2)) 208

unsuccessful party to pay 208

relevant factors

fraudulent conduct of party 726
 impropriety of successful party's actions 256
 wasted tribunal and arbitration costs (ICSID arbitral tribunal: ICSID 61(2)) 207–8

costs (UNCITRAL arbitral tribunal: Rules 38–40), *UPS* 487–8**cultural industries exception (NAFTA 2106 and Annex)** 477–85, 506–18: *see also UPS*

(merits), cultural industries exception (NAFTA 2106 and Annex 2016)/

Publications Assistance Program (PAP)

“cultural industries”, applicability to delivery mechanism (NAFTA 2017(a)) 482–4

“like circumstances”/“like situations” 484–5, 507–13

customary international law, modification by treaty 573–5

customary law

- international public policy and 251
- in Kenya (Harambee) 239–40, 251

damages, risk of double recovery

- multiple proceedings by company and shareholders 580–2
- parallel treaty and contract-based jurisdiction and 97

Denmark–Egypt BIT (1999) by article

- 1(v) (“every kind of asset including . . . concessions or other rights conferred by law or under contract”) 284–5
- 12 (applicability to “divergences or disputes which have arisen prior to its entry into force”) 274–80: *see also Helnan* (jurisdiction), objection *ratione temporis* (BIT 12) (“divergences or disputes”)
 - “dispute” and “divergence”, distinguishability 279
 - text 274–5, 278

diplomatic protection

- shareholders with nationality different from that of corporation, *Barcelona Traction* 96, 573–4
- treaty-based rights distinguished (jurisprudence)
 - Barcelona Traction* 96
 - Diallo* 575

disclosure obligation (including ICSID 43(a)/AR 34(2)(a))

- applicable law 615
- documents containing commercially confidential information 271–3, 292–4
- equality of parties and 613–19
- jurisprudence
 - Azurix* 613–20
 - Noble Ventures* 615
- tribunal’s discretionary power to request 613–17

disqualification of conciliator or arbitrator, *Saipem* 362, 402

El Salvador

- Aliens Law (Art. 4 (respect for the law/right to protection)) 153–4
- Constitution by article
 - 96 (respect for the law/protection of aliens) 153–4
 - 144 (treaties as part of the law) 147
- Investment Law by article
 - 14 (respect for the law/right to protection) 153–4
 - 15 (submission of disputes to ICSID) 167–8
- Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration Law 165–7
- Public Contracting and Acquisitions Law (Art. 165) 164–5

El Salvador–Spain BIT (1995)

- accordance with the laws and regulations of host country clause 140–4, 153–4
- interpretation of treaty as a whole 145
- as part of the law of El Salvador 147
- travaux préparatoires* 141–4

El Salvador–Spain BIT (1995) by article

- 1(2) (“investment”), “accordance with the laws and regulations”, applicability 141–4
- 2(1) (“investments made prior to entry into force . . . in accordance with the laws”) 145

El Salvador–Spain BIT (1995) by article (*cont.*)

- 3 (protection), “in accordance with its legislation” requirement 144–5
- 11 (arbitration clause), 134–7: *see also Inceysa* (jurisdiction and competence)
- XI (dispute resolutions clause), “consent” (*ratione voluntatis*), requirements (ICSID 25 (1)) 134–7

Energy Charter Treaty (1994) (ECT): *see also Plama* (Award)

- denial of Part III advantages in case of ownership or control by foreign nationals with no substantial business activities in Area (ECT 17(1))
 - “no substantial business activities” 678
 - “ownership or control by foreign company” 678–80
 - burden of proof 678–9
- good faith interpretation 689–90
- object and purpose (ECT 2), protection of foreign investments 696–7
- State responsibility for acts directed or controlled by the State (ILC 8) 713–14
- text (extracts) 727–32

Energy Charter Treaty (1994) (ECT) by article

- Part III (investment promotion and protection)
 - 10(1) (stable, equitable, favourable and transparent conditions) 695–701
 - fair and equitable treatment 698–9
 - text 697
 - umbrella clause, whether 700–1
 - unreasonable or discriminatory measures 699–700
 - 13 (expropriation) 695, 701–2
 - text 701
 - 17(1) (non-application of Part III in case of ownership or control by foreign nationals with no substantial business activities in Area) 678–80
 - text 677
- Part IV (miscellaneous provisions), 21 (taxation) 716–17
- Part V (dispute settlement)
 - 26(1) (jurisdiction), competition law violations, exclusion 720
 - 27 (inter-State disputes), applicability 720

equality of parties, disclosure obligation 613–19**estoppel**

- parallel proceedings in domestic courts or other tribunal
 - Pan Am Energy* 80–5
- proceedings not involving same matters and parties 84
- requirements
 - detriment/prejudice 84–5
 - reliance on act/undertaking 84–5
 - Temple of Preah Vihear* 84–5

exceptio non adimpleti contractus, alleged erroneous application in *Azurix* 597–600**exclusive remedy rule (ICSID 26)**

- exhaustion of local administrative or judicial remedies rule and
 - Helnan* 336–9
 - Saipem* 382–3, 427
 - Vivendi* 336, 339

exhaustion of local administrative or judicial remedies (including ICSID 26)

- effective and adequate remedy, need for 429
- jurisprudence
 - Generation Ukraine* 318–19, 337–9, 382, 428–9
 - Helnan* 318–19, 322–3, 334–40

Loewen 428

Saipem 382–3, 427–9

expropriation/nationalization, classification as/requirements

act of government or attributability to State 378–9, 381–2, 418–19, 430

judicial measure 378–80

compensation 646

continuing financial well-being/independence of “expropriated” company as counter-indication 196–9

creeping expropriation/“measure tantamount to nationalization or expropriation” 191–200
 ECT 13(1) 700–1

deprivation of use or reasonably expected economic benefit of property 192–3
 “in whole or significant part” 193

intention vs effects 195

loss of investment as result of financial crisis, illegality of actions 419–20

measure affecting total or substantial part of investment, need for 195, 419–20

“measure having similar effect” 418

regulatory takings 193

sole effects doctrine 195, 419–20

taking of rights under judicial or arbitral decision 378, 418

tax measures 79

expropriation/nationalization (jurisprudence)

ADC 646

Allard 379

Biloune 194–5

CME 194–5

Feldman 191–2

Foremost 194–5

Generation Ukraine 192–3

Impregilo 418–19

Iran–US Claims Tribunal 192–3

Metalclad 193–5

Myers 191, 193

Phillips 378

Plama 700–1

Pope & Talbot 191

Revere Copper 194–5

RFCC 418–19

Saipem 377–9, 416–30

Santa Elena 192–3

SGS v. Philippines 418–19

Starrett Housing 192–5, 701–2

Stran Greek Refineries 378

Tecmed 191–5, 702

Telenor 191–200

Tippetts 192–5

Waste Management 192–3, 418–19

fair and equitable treatment of alien

jurisprudence

CME 698

Eureko 698

fair and equitable treatment of alien (*cont.*)

LG&E 698
MTD 698
OPEC 698
Plama 698–9
Saluka 698
Tecmed 698
Thunderbird 698

protection and security of investment (including predictability and stability) 698–9
 transparency, need for 699

forum selection clause: *see* exclusive remedy rule (ICSID 26); exhaustion of local administrative or judicial remedies; forum selection clause in contract; forum selection clause in treaty/contract (jurisprudence)

forum selection clause in contract

preclusion of ICSID jurisdiction, whether
 in proceedings based on BIT 29–30
 proceedings not involving same matters and parties 20, 40, 84

forum selection clause in treaty/contract (jurisprudence)

Inceysa 163–8
Telefónica 29–30

fraudulent misrepresentation/fraud (*dol*): *see also* *Inceysa* (fraudulent actions); *Plama* (Award), fraudulent misrepresentation

effect on
 jurisdiction 150–1
 right to treaty protection 680–91
ex dolo malo non oritur actio/nemo auditur propriam turpitudinem allegans 150–1, 690–1

general principles of international law, as applicable law 146–9

good faith: *see also* fraudulent misrepresentation/fraud (*dol*)

definition 149–50
 general principle of international law 149–50
 obligation to notify investor's change of status 688–91

good faith/fraudulent misrepresentation/fraud (*dol*), jurisprudence

Inceysa 690
World Duty Free, 235–56, 690: *see also* *World Duty Free* (Perfume Contract claims)

head of State immunity, as procedural bar 251

***Helnan* (annulment)**

background
 Committee's summary of case 327–8
 Committee's task (ICSID 52(1)) 332
 procedural history 326–7
 challenged findings (causality and the termination of the Management Contract) 342–3
 Committee's analysis 343
 parties' positions
 applicant 342
 respondent 342–3
 challenged findings (characterization of dispute as contractual) 340–2
 parties' positions 341
 claimant 340

- Tribunal's position 341–2
- challenged findings (exhaustion of local remedies) (decision as manifest excess of powers) 333–40
 - Committee's analysis 334–40
 - agreement of parties/compromise as basis for determining 335–7
 - exclusive remedy rule (ICSID 26) and 336–9
 - failure to give parties chance to be heard 334–5
 - partial annulment (ICSID 52(3)) 339–40
 - serious departure from fundamental rules of procedure allegation 334–5
 - parties' arguments
 - applicant 333–4
 - respondent 334
- challenged findings (rejection of termination of contract as breach of treaty) 329–33
 - Committee's analysis 331–3
 - serious departure from fundamental rules of procedure allegation 332–3
 - Tribunal as judge of probative value of evidence (AR 34(1)) 332–3
 - parties' arguments
 - applicant 329–30
 - respondent 330
 - Tribunal's approach 330–1
- Committee's decision 343
- Helnan (jurisdiction)** 259–92
 - compétence de la compétence* (ICSID 41) 274
 - costs (adjournment to merits) 288
 - legal and factual background 268–9
 - objection *ratione materiae* (legal dispute arising directly out of an investment and involving Egypt) (ICSID 25(1)) 280–5
 - claimant's position 282–3
 - “investment”/“foreign investment”, requirements/relevant factors 284
 - respondent's position 280–2
 - Tribunal's decision 283–5
 - prima facie* case, sufficiency at jurisdiction stage 283–5
 - objection *ratione personae* (status of EGOH) 285–8
 - claimant's position 286–7
 - respondent's position 285–6
 - Tribunal's decision 287–8
 - exercise of functions in accordance with domestic law (ILC 4) test 288
 - objection *ratione temporis* (BIT 12) (“divergences or disputes”) 274–80
 - crystallization of dispute 279–80
 - “dispute” and “divergence”, distinguishability 279
 - parties' positions
 - claimant 276–8
 - respondent 274–6
 - Tribunal's decision 278–80
 - as preliminary issue 274
 - procedural history
 - constitution of Tribunal 270
 - request for arbitration 269–70
 - request for production of documents tied to *Wena Hotels* case 271

Helnan (jurisdiction) (*cont.*)

- Procedural Order No. 1 271–3
- request for provisional measures 269, 271
- Tribunal’s decision (finding of jurisdiction) 289–92

Helnan (merits) 292–326

- alleged breach of BIT 2(2) (unreasonable or discriminatory measures)/BIT 3 (fair and equitable treatment) (claimant’s arguments) 295–9
- 2003 Ministry inspections and downgrade 296–7, 314–15
- Cairo Arbitration 297
- Cairo Award 298
 - protection and security/unreasonable and discriminatory measures (BIT 2(2)) 298–9
- alleged breach of BIT 2(2) (unreasonable or discriminatory measures)/BIT 3 (fair and equitable treatment) (Tribunal’s considerations) 315–20
 - as breach of contract outside Tribunal’s jurisdiction 318
 - Cairo Award 319, 322–5
 - failure to exhaust local remedies 318–19
 - Tribunal’s conclusion 320
- alleged breach of BIT 5 (expropriation) (claimant’s arguments) 299, 314–15
 - Tribunal’s position 318–19
- factual background 289–91
 - Cairo Arbitration 290–1
- objection to admissibility (Cairo Award as *res judicata*)
 - parties’ positions
 - claimant 300–1
 - respondent 302–3
 - Tribunal’s position 308–13
 - identity of parties and cause of action, need for 309–13
 - recognition of judgment as part of national and international legal orders distinguished 309–11
- objection to admissibility (exhaustion of local remedies)
 - parties’ positions
 - claimant 301
 - respondent 302–3
 - Tribunal’s position 318–19, 322–3
- objection to the jurisdiction (“no legal interest”) 294
 - existence of investment at time dispute arises, sufficiency 307–8
 - parties’ positions
 - claimant 300
 - respondent 303
 - Tribunal’s decision 306–8
- parties’ positions (claimant) 295–302
 - compensation entitlement 299–300
 - relief sought 301–2, 311–13
- parties’ positions (respondent) 302–4
 - Cairo Arbitration/Award 302
 - claimant’s failure to sustain allegations 303–4
- procedural history (merits stage) 292–5
 - objection to the jurisdiction (respondent) 294
 - request for production of documents tied to *Wena Hotels* case
 - Procedural Order No. 1 292–4

- Procedural Order No. 2 293
- timetable (19 October 2006) 292
 - amendment (28 June 2007) 294
- procedural history (preliminary objections) 291–2
- Tribunal’s decision 325–6
- Tribunal’s position
 - alleged breaches of BIT 2(2), 3 and 5 314–25
 - applicable law (ICSID 42(1)) (BIT) 304
 - jurisdiction
 - breach of investment contract as breach of BIT 305–6
 - interpretation/evaluation of domestic law, exclusion 305
 - obligation to accept plausible facts 305
 - parallel bases in treaty and contract 304–5, 318
- Hungarian Public Telephone Service, reorganization** 178–9
- Hungary–Norway BIT (1991) by article**
 - I (“investment”) 190–1
 - III (promotion and protection of investments) 200–6
 - VI (expropriation and compensation) 191–200
 - XI (dispute settlement in relation to BIT VI expropriation and compensation) 200
 - text (extracts) 179–80
- IBA Rules of Evidence (1999) by article**
 - 3 (documents) 271–3
 - 9.2 (admissibility of evidence: grounds for exclusion) 271–3
- ICC (International Chamber of Commerce)**
 - Arbitration Rules (1998)
 - 2.8 420–1
 - domestic courts and 420–1
- ICSID Arbitration Rules (1984)**
 - 6(1) (date of constitution) 214
 - 8 (incapacity or resignation of arbitrator) 215
 - 10(2) (vacancy: suspension of proceedings) 215
 - 11(1) (filling a vacancy) 215–16
 - 38(1) (declaration of closure) 295
 - 42(4) (joinder to the merits) 231
- ICSID Arbitration Rules (2003)**
 - 4(1) (request to Chairman of Administrative Council for nomination) 107
 - 6 (constitution of tribunal) 8–9, 107–8, 176
 - 6(1) (date and confirmation of constitution) 107, 176, 270, 361–2, 401
 - 22 (procedural languages) 9
 - 28(1) (cost of proceeding: allocation) 108
 - 32(3) (right of members of tribunal to put questions) 9, 109
 - 34(1) (Tribunal as judge of admissibility of evidence and probative value) 332–3, 415
 - 34(2)(a) (production of documents etc.) 271, 613–20
 - 35(1) (examination of witnesses and experts) 109
 - 38(1) (declaration of closure) 295, 555, 673
 - 38(2) (reopening of proceedings) 295
 - 39 (provisional measures) 386
 - 39(4) (provisional measures: opportunity to present observations) 108

ICSID Arbitration Rules (2003) (cont.)

- 41(1) (preliminary objections (“not with the jurisdiction of the Centre”/“not within the competence of the tribunal”): time-limits) 56–7, 306–7
- 41(2) (preliminary objections: tribunal’s right to determine at any time that dispute is within its competence) (*compétence de la compétence*) 274, 564
- 41(3) (preliminary objections: suspension of proceedings/time-limits for comment) 9, 108, 176, 270
- 42(1) (applicable law as agreed by parties/law of Contracting State) 304
- 52(2) (constitution of *ad hoc* Committee: notification) 536, 553
- 52(2) (constitution of *ad hoc* Committee: notification/declaration of acceptance of conformity with AR 6(2)) 536–7
- 54(1) (stay of enforcement: right to request) 536–7
- 54(2) (stay of enforcement: notification) 553

ICSID Convention (1965) by article

- 14(1) (panel members: qualifications) 362, 402
- 25(1): *see* legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1))
- 26: *see* exclusive remedy rule (ICSID 26); exhaustion of local administrative or judicial remedies (including ICSID 26)
- 37(2)(b) (constitution of tribunal: number of arbitrators) 8, 107
- 38 (appointment of arbitrators by chairman) 8, 107
- 42(1): *see* applicable law (arbitration including in particular ICSID 42(1))
- 47 (provisional measures) 386
- 52 (annulment): *see* annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52) (*ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 52(3))); annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52) (general including procedural matters); annulment of arbitral award (ICSID 52), grounds; costs (ICSID *ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 61(2) and 52(4)))
- 61(2) (costs): *see* costs (ICSID *ad hoc* Committee (ICSID 61(2) and 52(4))); costs (ICSID arbitral tribunal: ICSID 61(2))

ICSID Convention (1965), interpretation

- applicable law
 - international law 367
 - VCLT (1969) 631
- guidelines, object and purpose 27

Inceysa (background)

- facts 109–11
- procedure 106–9
 - applicable law (ICSID Arbitration Rules) 108
 - constitution of Tribunal 107–8
 - parties’ allegations 106–7
 - request for provisional measures (AR 39) 108
 - suspension of proceedings (AR 41(3)) 108
 - timetable 108
- provisional measures (Tribunal’s decision) 129

Inceysa (fraudulent actions)

- parties’ positions (claimant)
 - expropriation 111–12
 - rejoinder to respondent’s reply 121–2
 - competence of the Tribunal 121–2
 - expropriation 121
 - protection of investments under BIT 122

- request 112
- response to respondent's objections to jurisdiction 116–19
 - alleged fraud 117–18
 - consent of El Salvador to ICSID jurisdiction 118
 - protection of investments under BIT 119
- termination of contract 112
- parties' positions (respondent)
 - consent to ICSID jurisdiction 113–14
 - fraud 114–16
 - protection of investments under BIT 112–13
 - reply to claimant's response 119–21
 - fraud 120–1
 - protection of investments under BIT 119–20
 - request 116
- parties' positions (Tribunal's considerations and conclusions) (alleged fraud/falsity of information) 122–9
 - claimants' alleged contracts with Silay (Philippines) and Coclé (Amunco) (Panama) 129
 - connection between claimant and ICASUR 127–9
 - experience and capacity of claimant's sole administrator 126–7
 - financial statements submitted by claimant 123–4
- Inceysa (jurisdiction and competence)** 129–68
 - applicable law (BIT 11(3)) 146–9
 - general rules and principles of international law 146–9
 - competence of ICSID (ICSID Convention, BIT and El Salvador investment law) 130–54
 - compétence de la compétence* (ICSID 41) 132–4
 - consent to ICSID jurisdiction (ICSID 25)
 - accordance with the laws and regulations of host country clause 140–1
 - guidelines for determining 137–40
 - interrelationship with BIT XI 134–7
 - determination of jurisdiction
 - considerations relating to merits distinguished 133–4
 - as objective decision/avoidance of presumptions 137–8
 - interpretation of BIT (intention of the parties) 138–40, 168
 - interpretation of treaty as a whole 145
 - travaux préparatoires* 141–4
 - issue for decision 132
 - parties' positions
 - claimant 130–1
 - respondent 131–2
- competence of Tribunal (contract) 154–68
 - parties' arguments
 - claimant 154–6, 160–2
 - respondent 156–62
 - Tribunal's analysis (forum selection provisions) 163–8
 - Clause 13 163
 - Clause 17 163
 - Clause 21 163–4
 - Tribunal's analysis (legislative consent to jurisdiction) 164–8

Inceysa (jurisdiction and competence) (cont.)

- Investment Law 167–8
- Mediation, Conciliation and Arbitration Law 165–7
- Public Contracting and Acquisitions Law 164–5

costs 168–9

relevant considerations

- compliance of investment with law of El Salvador 153–4
- ex dolo malo non oritur actio* principle 150–1
- good faith obligation 149–50
- international public policy 151–3
- unjust enrichment 153

res judicata (identity of parties and cause of action) 146–7

Tribunal's decision 169

Institution Rules (ICSID) (IR)

- 5 (acknowledgment of request) 8, 175, 213, 400–1, 667
- 5(2) (transmission of request and documentation to other party) 106, 361
- 6 (registration of request) 667
- 6(2) (registration of request as date of institution) 54
- 7 (notice of request) 8, 175, 214, 361, 402, 667
- 7(d) (invitation to parties to constitute commission/tribunal) 107

interest

- jurisprudence
 - Saipem* 434
 - Vivendi* 434
- simple 434

International Court of Justice (ICJ), *prima facie* jurisdiction, *Oil Platforms* 55, 193–4**international public policy**

- bribery/corruption and 241
- definitions
 - domestic public policy applied to foreign awards 240–3
 - universally accepted norms/transnational public policy 240
 - objective establishment of norm, need for 241
- fraud and 151–3
- jurisprudence
 - European Gas Turbines SA v. Westman International* 241–3
 - Inceysa* 151–3
 - W v. F and V* 241
 - World Duty Free* 240–6
- local custom, relationship with 251

investment agreements

- breach as treaty claim 74–5
- dispute settlement provisions 70–2
- “investment dispute”, breach of investment agreement as 75–6
- “investment”/“foreign investment”, definition/classification as (general considerations including procedural matters), applicable law, BIT provisions 25–9
- “investment”/“foreign investment”, definition/classification as (treaty formulations/possibilities for inclusion)
 - “any kind of property” 368, 376–7
 - “credit for sums of money” 377

- “every kind of asset including . . . concessions or other rights conferred by law or under contract” 284–5
- rights arising under an arbitration award 377
- “investment”/“foreign investment” (jurisprudence)**
- AAPL* 308
 - Bayindir* 367
 - Fraport* 308
 - Helnan* 283–5, 307–8
 - LESI-DIPENTA* 367, 372
 - Olguín* 373–4
 - PSEG* 367
 - Saipem* 367, 372–4
 - Salini* 140–1, 308, 367, 372
 - SOABI* 373
 - Tokios Tokelés* 140, 373–4
 - Tradex* 373–4
 - Wena Hotels* 373–4
- “investment”/“foreign investment”, requirements/relevant factors**
- in accordance with the laws and regulations of host State 140–4, 153–4
 - as test of validity of investment and definition distinguished 367
 - contribution to host State’s development 284
 - duration 284
 - origin of assets or funds 373–4
 - regularity of profit 284
 - risk 284, 373
 - substantial commitment 284
- “investor”/“foreign investor”**
- evidence of status as, participation in privatization process 27–8
 - jurisprudence, *Inceysa* 140–9
- jurisdiction (general)**, “competence” as alternative term (ICSID Arbitration Rules 41(1)) 56–7
- jurisdiction (ICSID)**
- admissibility distinguished 31–2
 - applicable law, jurisdiction and merits distinguished 365
 - burden/standard of proof 368
 - prima facie* legal case requirement, 55–6, 60, 191–200: *see also* jurisdiction, *prima facie* legal case requirement (jurisprudence)
 - competence/duty of tribunal to determine (*compétence de la compétence*) (ICSID 41(1))
 - disputes relating to breach of BIT/treaty, determination of jurisdiction and considerations relating to merits distinguished 133–4
 - jurisprudence
 - Azurix* 569
 - Inceysa* 132–4
 - Lucchetti* 568–9
 - Pan American Energy* 56
 - as objective decision/avoidance of presumptions 137–8
 - parties’ arguments, relevance 370
 - exclusion, appeal against application of domestic law 305

jurisdiction (ICSID) (*cont.*)

- objection to, submission “as early as possible” (AR 41(1)) 306–7
- parallel bases in treaty and contract
 - Aguas del Tunari* 304–5
 - Camuzzi* 304–5
 - Eureko* 304–5
 - Helnan* 304–5, 318
 - Impregilo* 304–5
 - National Grid* 304–5
 - Saipem* 380–1
 - Sempra* 304–5
 - Suez [Aguas]* 304–5
 - Vivendi* 304–5
- as preliminary issue 133–4

jurisdiction (NAFTA)

- claims arising before entry into force of NAFTA, continuing wrongful act 448–50
- exclusion of disputes relating to
 - cultural industries (Annex 2106) 477–85, 506–18
 - subsidies or grants (NAFTA 1108(7)(b)) 505

jurisdiction, *prima facie* legal case requirement (jurisprudence)

- Amco* 55
- Bayindir* 368
- El Paso* 368
- Enron I* 55–6
- Helnan* 283–5
- Impregilo* 21, 368–9
- Jan de Nul* 368
- Oil Platforms* 55, 369
- Pan American Energy* 55–6, 60, 79
- Plama* 193–4, 368
- Saipem* 368
- SGS v. Philippines* 193–4
- Siemens* 55, 368
- Telefónica* 21
- Telenor* 182, 191–200, 368
- UPS* 368–9

Kenya: *see also* *World Duty Free* (Perfume Contract claims)

- bribery and corruption
 - Anti-Corruption and Economic Crimes Act 250–1
 - Prevention of Corruption Act 1956 250–1
- customary law (Harambee) 239–40, 251
- head of State immunity (Constitution 14), as procedural bar 251

Kyoto Convention (1973/1999) 473–4**language of proceedings:** *see* procedure (ICSID)**legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1))**

- continuity of dispute, existence of investment at time dispute arises, relevance 307–8
- critical date, crystallization 279–80
- “directly”

- general measures not directly related to investment 59–60
 - exchange policy 23–5
 - rights arising from arbitration award 374, 377
 - singling out of entity by name, relevance 24
 - “dispute”
 - “dispute” and “divergence”, distinguishability 279
 - hypothetical questions, exclusion 85–8
 - “investment”: *see* “investment”/“foreign investment”
 - jurisprudence
 - CMS* 24–5, 60
 - East Timor* 63
 - Enron* 24–5
 - Helnan* 280–5
 - Mavrommatis* 63
 - Methanex* 24, 59
 - Pan American Energy* 57–76
 - Saipem* 371–5
 - Telefónica* 23–9
 - “legal” dispute
 - conflicting views of rights or obligations, need for 63
 - dispute dealing with existence or scope of legal rights 61–3, 371–2
 - dispute requiring application of rules of law and legal solutions 23
 - statutory or contract-based claim as 63–5
 - as objective requirement 63
 - prima facie* case, sufficiency at jurisdiction stage 283–5
 - legitimate expectations**, fair and equitable treatment and 698–9
 - “like circumstances”**: *see* national treatment, “like circumstances”/“like situations”
- measure of compensation/valuation of company (with particular reference to expropriation claims)**
- applicable law
 - BIT/treaty provision 430–4
 - customary international law 432–3
 - burden/standard of proof 433–4
 - fair market value, “according to internationally acknowledged evaluation standards” 432–3
 - relevant factors, unlawful and lawful expropriation distinguished 432–3, 646
- measure of compensation/valuation of company (with particular reference to expropriation claims), elements for possible inclusion**
- costs incurred, excluded costs 433
 - value of judicial award “expropriated” 433
- measure of compensation/valuation of company (with particular reference to expropriation claims) (jurisprudence)**, *Chorzów Factory* 432–3
- MFN (most favoured nation) treatment**: *see also* Argentina–Spain BIT (1991) by article, IV(2) (MFN treatment)
- dispute settlement provisions, applicability to
 - jurisprudence
 - Ambatielos* 34
 - Gas Natural* 36–8, 202–3
 - Maffezini* 34–7, 39, 201–4

MFN (most favoured nation) treatment (*cont.*)*Plama* 37, 203–4*Salini* 37, 203–4*Siemens* 37–8, 202–3*Suez [Aguas]* 206*Telefónica* 31–9*Telenor* 200–6

treaty-shopping, need to avoid 204

eiusdem generis rule 32–5

general features 33

automaticity 33

sources of better treatment 33

NAFTA (1992)

applicability, continuing wrong 448–50

compliance as obligation of result 464

State responsibility (NAFTA 1502(3)(a))/NAFTA 1503(2) 464

NAFTA (1992) by article

Part V, Chapter 11, Section A (Investment)

1102 455–63, 467–77

1102 (national treatment) 491–505

1103 (MFN treatment) 486–7

1104 (standard of treatment) 486–7

1105 (minimum standard of treatment) 487

1108(7)(b) (subsidy exception) 505, 517–18

Part V, Chapter 11, Section B (Settlement of Disputes)

1116(2) (time limits) 448–50

1117(2) (time limits) 450

Part V, Chapter 15

1502(3)(a) 463–7, 518–27

1503(2) 463–7, 518–27

Part VII, Chapter 21

2106 and Annex (cultural industries) 477–85

2107(a) 482–4

NAFTA (1992), interpretation

guidelines

good faith in accordance with ordinary meaning (VCLT 31(1)) 66–7

ordinary meaning 458–9

in context 459–62

NAFTA as *lex specialis* 458–63

phrases

“delegation” (NAFTA 1502(3)) 464

“regulatory, administrative or other governmental authority” (NAFTA 1502(3)(a)/
NAFTA 1503(2)) 463–7, 518–27

“State enterprise” (NAFTA 1502(3)) 464

“treatment” (NAFTA 1102) 469–70

national of another contracting State (juridical person) (ICSID 25(2)(b)), risk of

multiple claims 581–2

national treatmentjurisprudence, *UPS* 467–77, 491–505

- “like circumstances”/“like situations” 467–77, 491–505
 - competitive relationship test 493–5
 - cultural industries exception (NAFTA 2106 and Annex 2016) 484–5, 507–13
 - postal vs express consignment/courier services 470–4, 495–9, 513–17
 - public policy considerations as distinguishing factor 491–3, 499–500
 - “same economic sector” requirement 493
- NAFTA/GATT/GATS provisions compared 500–2
- non-compliance (NAFTA 1102), required elements 469
 - burden/standard of proof 469, 474, 495
 - “treatment” 469–70
- procurement exception: *see* procurement exception (NAFTA 1108(7)(a))
- subsidy exception (NAFTA 1108(7)(a)) 505, 517–18
- New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards (1958)**
 - by article**
 - 2 425–7
 - 5(2) 240
- non-discrimination obligation**, ECT 10(1) (stable, equitable, favourable and transparent conditions) 699–700
- Pan American Energy* (preliminary objections)**
 - competence of the Tribunal (general)
 - BIT VII provisions 53
 - compétence de la compétence* (ICSID 41(1)) 56
 - “competence” and “jurisdiction” as alternative terms (ICSID Arbitration Rules 41(1)) 56–7
 - consultation and negotiation (BIT VII(2)) 53, 54
 - institution of proceedings 54
 - precedent, role 54
 - prima facie* legal case requirement 55–6, 60, 79
- factual background, Argentine economic and financial crisis 49–50
- interpretation of BIT/treaties (VCLT)
 - effectiveness (*ut res magis valeat quam pereat*) (*effet utile*) 79
 - good faith in accordance with ordinary meaning (VCLT 31(1)) 66–7
 - investment agreement, breach as treaty claim 74–5
 - “investment dispute” (BIT VII) 73
 - breach of investment agreement as (BIT VII(1)(a)) 75–6, 80
- objection (first) (legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1)))
 - “directly”, general measures not directly related to investment 59–60
 - parties’ positions
 - claimants 58–9
 - respondent 57–8
 - Tribunal’s conclusion 60
 - Tribunal’s considerations 59–60
- objection (second) (“legal” dispute) 60–76
 - conflict view of rights or obligations, need for 63
 - contract-based claim as 63–5
 - parties’ arguments (claimant) 64–5
 - parties’ arguments (respondent) 64
 - Tribunal’s considerations 65
 - dispute dealing with existence or scope of legal rights 61–3

Pan American Energy (preliminary objections) (cont.)

- parties' arguments (claimant) 62–3
- parties' arguments (respondent) 61–2
- Tribunal's conclusion 63
- Tribunal's considerations 63
- introduction 60–1
- as objective requirement 63
- “umbrella clause”, effect 66–76
 - parties' arguments (claimants) 66
 - parties' arguments (respondent) 66
 - State as sovereign vs State as merchant considerations 73
 - Tribunal's conclusion 73–4
 - Tribunal's considerations 66–76
 - Tribunal's decision 75–6
- “umbrella clause”, effect (jurisprudence)
 - Eureko* 70–2
 - Joy Machinery* 72–3
 - Noble Ventures* 70–2
 - Salini* 72
 - SGS v. Pakistan* 68–9, 73–5
 - SGS v. Philippines* 69–70
 - Vivendi II* 72–3
- objection (third) (limitation of claim with respect to tax measures (BIT XII(2))) 76
 - parties' arguments
 - claimant 77–9
 - respondent 76–7
 - relationship with BIT II(2)(a) and IV 79–80
 - fair and equitable treatment provisions, applicability 79
 - tax measures as BIT IV expropriation 79
 - relationship with BIT V (transfers) 79–80
 - Tribunal's considerations 79–80
 - Tribunal's decision 80
- objection (fourth) (estoppel on grounds of parallel proceedings in domestic courts) 80–5
 - estoppel, conditions 84–5
 - parties' arguments
 - claimants 81–3
 - respondent 80–1
 - proceedings not involving same matters and parties 84
 - Tribunal's considerations 84–5
 - Tribunal's decision 85
- objection (fifth) (exclusion of hypothetical claims) 85–8
 - parties' arguments
 - claimants 86–7
 - respondent 85–7
 - Tribunal's considerations 87–8
 - Tribunal's decision 88
- objection (sixth) (standing) 88–95
 - claims on behalf of foreign shareholders 96–7
 - parties' arguments

- claimants 90–5
 - respondent 88–90
- as preliminary issue 95
- Tribunal’s considerations 95–7
- Tribunal’s decision 97
- procedural background 46–9
 - applicable law (ICSID Arbitration Rules) 48
 - claimants’ position
 - claims 50–3
 - status 50
 - consolidation of cases 47–8
 - constitution of Tribunal 47
 - timetable 48
 - witness testimony 48–9
- request for further evidence 97–8
- Tribunal’s decision 98–9
- place of arbitration**, as acceptance of risk of revocation of arbitrator by local courts 430
- Plama (Award)**
 - background (ECT provisions) 666
 - background (facts/summary of dispute)
 - refinery (operation and bankruptcy) 675–6
 - summary of dispute 676–7
 - background (procedural history) 666–73
 - constitution of the tribunal 668
 - decision on jurisdiction 669
 - disclosure of documents 670–1
 - registration of request for arbitration 666–7
 - replacement of claimant’s counsel 671
 - request for provisional measures 670
 - security for costs/*cautio judicatum solvi* 671–2
 - claims
 - parties’ positions
 - claimant 692–4
 - respondent 694–5
 - Tribunal’s summary 691
 - claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) and 13 obligations) (access to Varna Port) 717–20
 - parties’ positions
 - claimant 717–18
 - respondent 718
 - Tribunal’s analysis 718–20
 - Tribunal’s decision 720
 - claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) and 13 obligations) (actions of syndics (appointed managers)) 709–14
 - claims
 - irregularities in the appointment of the syndics 710
 - misappropriation of Nova Plama’s funds 710–11
 - overloading of debt by syndics 710
 - parallel recovery plan 711–12
 - unlawful increases in the salaries of Nova Plama workers 710
 - worker riots 711

Plama (Award) (cont.)

- Tribunal's analysis 713–14
 - State responsibility for acts directed or controlled by the State (ILC 8) 713–14
 - Tribunal's conclusion 714
- claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) and 13 obligations) (Biochim Bank)
 - acts directed or controlled by the State (ILC 8) 722–3
 - parties' positions 720–1
 - respondent 721–2
 - Tribunal's analysis and conclusions 722–3
- claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) and 13 obligations) (environmental damages) 702–9
 - parties' positions
 - claimant 702–5
 - respondent 705–6
 - Tribunal's analysis 706–9
 - Tribunal's conclusion 709
- claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) and 13 obligations) (paper profits) 714–17
 - parties' positions
 - claimant 714–15
 - respondent 715–16
 - Tribunal's analysis and conclusions (including ECT 21 (taxation)) 716–17
- claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) and 13 obligations) (re-opened bankruptcy proceedings) 723–4
- claims (alleged breach of ECT 10(1) protections (stable, equitable, favourable and transparent conditions)) 695–701
 - constant protection and security 699
 - ECT 10(1) as umbrella clause 700–1
 - fair and equitable treatment 698–9
 - legitimate expectations 698–9
 - non-discrimination/reasonableness obligation 699–700
 - protection and security of investment (including predictability and stability) 698–9
 - transparency, need for 699
- claims (alleged breach of ECT 13 protections (expropriation)) 701–2
- denial of Part III advantages in case of ownership or control by foreign nationals with no substantial business activities in Area (ECT 17(1)) 678–80
 - “no substantial business activities” 678
 - “ownership or control by foreign company” (PCL) 678–80
 - burden of proof 678–9
 - parties' positions 678–9
 - Tribunal's analysis of claimant's evidence and arguments 679–80
 - Tribunal's decision 680
- fraudulent misrepresentation 680–91
 - approval by Privatization Agency and 683–4
 - consequences, Privatization Act, Art. 5(1) 687
 - fraudulent actions/*ex dolo malo non oritur actio* principle 690–1
 - good faith (obligation to notify investor's change of status) 688–91
 - jurisdiction, relevance to 683
 - occurrence of (Tribunal's analysis) 684–7
 - parties' positions
 - claimant 682–3
 - respondent 680–2

- Tribunal's decision 691
- treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(1)) (general rule: good faith, ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose) 696–7
- Tribunal's concluding observations 724
- Tribunal's decision 726–7
 - costs 724–6
 - damages 724
- precedent (ICSID arbitral tribunal)**
 - decision of a different tribunal 54
 - non-binding nature 54, 365
 - previous ICSID tribunal decision 54, 365, 410
 - decision on jurisdiction 410–11
- procedure (ICSID)**
 - consolidation and identical tribunals, *Pan American* 47–8
 - constitution of tribunal: *see also* Institution Rules (ICSID) (IR)
 - constitution of tribunal (AR 6) 8–9, 107–8, 176, 270
 - language
 - English and Spanish 9
 - translation of documents into language of proceedings, need for 9
 - president, appointment, by Chairman of the Administrative Council 8
 - registration of request (ICSID 36(3)) 8, 107, 175, 214, 361, 667
- procurement exception (NAFTA 1108(7)(a))**
 - jurisprudence
 - ADF* 477, 502–3
 - Dussault* 477, 504–5
 - UPS* 474–7, 502–5
- provisional measures (including ICSID 47)**
 - criteria, balance of parties' interests 386–8
 - jurisprudence
 - CSOB* 386
 - Helnan* 271
 - Maffezini* 386
 - Pey Casado* 386
 - Saipem* 384–8
 - World Duty Free* 216–17
 - possible measures, prohibition of publication of information concerning the case 216–17
 - requirements
 - necessity/urgency 386–8
 - non-prejudice to merits 387–8
 - tribunal's powers, discretionary nature 386
- public policy: *see also* international public policy**
 - balancing the public policy burden 252–4
 - New York Convention (1958) 240
 - UNCITRAL Model Law 1985 240
- res judicata***
 - domestic court judgment, qualification as 309–11
 - recognition as part of national and international legal orders distinguished 309–11
 - identity of parties and cause of action, need for 146–7, 309–13
 - jurisprudence

res judicata (*cont.*)

- Amco* 309
- CME* 309
- Fraport* 310
- Helnan* 308–13
- Inceysa* 146–7

Saipem (jurisdiction and provisional measures)

- admissibility
 - abuse of process 383–4
 - exhaustion of local remedies (ICSID 26) 382–3
- applicable law 365–6
 - interpretation of BIT 368, 376–7
 - jurisdiction and merits distinguished 365
- burden/standard of proof/*prima facie* legal case 368
- costs 384
- expropriation (BIT 5) 375, 377–9
 - act of government or attributability to State 378–9
 - act of judicial authority as 378–9
 - of rights under judicial or arbitral decisions 378
- factual background
 - ICC arbitration 356–9
 - origin of dispute 356
 - parties 355
 - pipeline contract 355–6
 - arbitration clause (text) 355–6
 - related litigation 360
- “investment” (BIT 1(1)) 376
 - “any kind of property” 376–7
 - “credit for sums of money” (BIT 1(1)(c)) 377
- “investment” (ICSID 25(1)) 372–4
 - origin of funds, relevance 373–4
- jurisdiction (BIT 9) 375–82
 - contract claim alternative 380–1
 - text 375–82
- legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1)) 371–5
 - “directly” 374
 - “legal” dispute as dispute dealing with existence or scope of legal rights 371–2
- parties’ positions
 - claimant 363–4
 - respondent 364–5
- precedent (ICSID decisions) 365
- procedural history 360–5
 - appointment of arbitrators 361–2
 - constitution of Tribunal 361–2
 - oral hearings (jurisdiction) 363
 - proposal for disqualification of Professor Schreuer 362
 - request for arbitration/claims for relief 360–1
 - written proceedings 362
- provisional measures 384–8

- discretionary nature of Tribunal's powers 386
- facts 384–5
- parties' positions
 - claimant 387
 - respondent 387
- relevant provisions
 - AR 39 386
 - ICSID 47 386
- request 385
- requirements/criteria
 - balance of parties' interests 386–8
 - necessity/urgency requirement 386–8
 - non-prejudice to the merits 387–8
- Tribunal's conclusion 388
- Tribunal's determination 387–8
- Tribunal's recommendation 388
- Tribunal's analysis (jurisdiction) 365–84
 - summary of parties' positions 366
 - summary of respondent's objections 367
- Tribunal's decision 384
- Saipem (merits)**
 - applicable law (ICSID 42(1)) 411–12
 - burden/standard of proof 415
 - costs 434
 - exhaustion of local remedies 427–9
 - effective remedy requirement 429
 - expropriation (BIT 5) 416–30
 - act of government or attributability to State 418–19, 430
 - illegality requirement 419–20
 - jurisdiction of Bangladeshi courts to revoke authority of ICC arbitral tribunal 420–1
 - alleged abuse of right 422–5
 - alleged breach of the New York Convention 425–7
 - alleged breach of the principles of international arbitration 425
 - alleged conspiracy and collusion 422
 - Bangladeshi Arbitration Act 1940 (revocability of authority of arbitrator) 420–1
 - as breach of principles of international law 421–7
 - decision of Supreme Court rendering ICC Award non-existent 427
 - ICC Rules, relevance 420–1
 - Tribunal's conclusion 427
 - measure affecting total or substantial part of investment, need for 419–20
 - “measure having similar effect” (BIT 5(2)) 418
 - of rights under judicial or arbitral decisions 418
 - sole effects doctrine 419–20
 - expropriation (measure of compensation) 430–4
 - interest 434
 - parties' positions
 - claimant 430–2
 - respondent 432
 - Tribunal's determination 432–4
 - applicability of customary international law/*Chorzów Factory* principle 432–3

Saipem (merits) (*cont.*)

- excluded claims 433
- unlawful and lawful expropriation distinguished 432–3
- Warranty Bond, failure to meet burden of proof 433–4
- value of judicial award “expropriated” 433
- facts
 - origin of dispute
 - compensation for delay 394
 - completion of project, retention money and warranty bond 393–4
 - delay in project 392
 - extension of completion date 392
 - ICC arbitration/intervention of Bangladeshi courts 394–400
 - parties 391
 - pipeline contract
 - applicable law (law of Bangladesh) 392
 - arbitration clause (text) 392
 - summary of provisions 391–2
- ICC arbitration/intervention of Bangladeshi courts as basis of dispute 394–400, 412–14
 - choice of Dhaka as place of arbitration as acceptance of risk of revocation of arbitrator by local courts 430
 - parties’ positions
 - claimant 412–13
 - respondent 413–14
 - Tribunal’s analysis and conclusions 413–14
- parties’ positions
 - claimant 407–9
 - respondent 409
- precedent (ICSID decisions) 410
 - appointment of arbitrators 401
 - constitution of Tribunal 401–2
 - jurisdictional phase 402–3
 - oral hearings (merits) 406–7
 - procedural order (25 May 2007) 403–4
 - procedural order (8 February 2008) 403–4
 - written phase (merits) 403–6
- procedural history
 - proposal for disqualification of Professor Schreuer 402
 - request for arbitration/claims for relief 400–1
- Tribunal’s analysis 410
 - questions for decision 415–16
- Tribunal’s decision 435
- separability**, contract 252
- standard of treatment of alien**
 - balance of interests of State and investor/development of international economic activities 696–9
 - “most constant/full protection and security” 699
- standing (BITs provision)**, BIT protection of interest other than ownership or contractual 578–80
- standing (ICSID)**
 - claims on behalf of foreign shareholders 96–7

- derivative claims 30–1
 - as preliminary issue 95
- standing (jurisprudence)**
 - Azurix* 564: *see also* *Azurix* (annulment), grounds (manifest excess of power (ICSID 52 (1)(b)) (standing/derivative claims))
 - Barcelona Traction* 28, 95–6, 573–4
 - Pan Am Energy* 88–95
 - Telefónica* 30–1
- standing (NAFTA 1116/NAFTA 1117)**
 - distinguishability 451
 - jurisprudence
 - Mondev* 451
 - Pope & Talbot* 451
 - UPS* 451
 - loss or damage arising from breach of NAFTA 1503(2) or 1502(3)(a) (NAFTA 1116(1)), need for
 - causality and 452
 - sufficiency to establish jurisdiction 452
- State agency/State organ, classification as (in particular for purposes of State responsibility and State immunity)**
 - examples
 - Canada Post 455–67, 478–9, 518–27
 - EGOTH 286–7
 - State enterprise (NAFTA 1503) and government monopoly (NAFTA 1502) distinguished 464
 - test, exercise of legislative, executive, judicial or any other functions . . . in accordance with domestic law (ILC 4) 288
- State enterprise (NAFTA 1503)**, State responsibility for compliance with NAFTA obligations 455–67, 518–27
- State responsibility, *lex specialis* (ILC 55)** 458–63
- State responsibility for conduct of private persons or entities**
 - acts directed or controlled by the State (ILC 8), *Plama* 713–14, 722–3
 - empowerment to exercise elements of governmental authority (ILC 5) 462–3
 - “exercise of governmental authority”, limitation to 466–7
- State responsibility for conduct of State organ/entity (ILC 4)**
 - applicable law, BIT/*lex specialis* 458–63
 - judicial authorities (ILC 4(1)) 378–80
- State responsibility, elements/requirements**
 - actual damage/loss, relevance (ILC *Commentary* 2(9)) 40
 - breach of international obligation (ILC 2(b))/classification of act as internationally wrongful (ILC 3) 426
 - legality of act under internal law, relevance (ILC 3(b)) 426
- stay of enforcement of arbitral award: *see also* *Azurix*** (stay of enforcement)
 - pending decision in action for annulment 536–46, 553–4
 - security, provision of 542–6, 553–4
- tax measures**, relating to transfers 79–80
- Telefónica* (preliminary objections)**
 - objections (first and second) (legal dispute arising directly out of investment (ICSID 25(1)))

Telefónica (preliminary objections) (cont.)

- “directly”, general measures not directly related to investment 23–5
- “investment”/“foreign investment” 25–9
 - participation in privatization process as evidence of 27–8
- “legal” dispute 23
- parties’ arguments
 - claimant 13–14
 - respondent 12–13
- Tribunal’s analysis 23–9
- objection (third) (forum selection clause in contract/exclusive jurisdiction of municipal courts)
 - parties’ arguments
 - claimant 15–16
 - respondent 15
 - Tribunal’s analysis 29–30
- objection (fourth) (standing (international/municipal law))
 - parties’ arguments
 - claimant 16–18
 - respondent 16
 - Tribunal’s analysis 30–1
- objection (fifth) (time-limits (18 months rule) (BIT X)/MFN clause (BIT IV(2)))
 - iusdem generis* rule 32–5
 - parties’ arguments
 - claimant 19–20
 - respondent 18–19
 - parties’ subsequent practice establishing agreement concerning interpretation (VCLT 31(3)(b)) 38–9
 - “practice” 38–9
 - Tribunal’s analysis 31–9
- objection (sixth) (actual damage/loss, relevance (ILC *Commentary* 2(9)))
 - parties’ arguments
 - claimant 20
 - respondent 20
 - preclusion of ICSID jurisdiction in proceedings not involving same matters and parties 20, 40
 - Tribunal’s analysis 40
- procedural and factual background 8–9
 - constitution of Tribunal 8–9
 - facts (as submitted by the claimant) 9–11
 - objections summarized 11–12
 - suspension of proceedings (AR 41(3)) 9
- Tribunal’s decision 40

Telenor

- alleged breach of fair and equitable treatment requirement (BIT III) 200–6
 - limitation of Tribunal’s jurisdiction to compensation and expropriation (BIT XI) 200
 - Tribunal’s conclusion 206
- alleged expropriation
 - continuing financial well-being/independence of “expropriated” company 196–9
 - “expropriation” (BIT VI) 191–200
 - failure to establish *prima facie* case 195–200

- “investment” (BIT 1) 190–1
- Tribunal’s conclusion 200
- MFN treatment (BIT IV) as means of extending Tribunal’s BIT XI jurisdiction 200–6
 - treaty-shopping, avoidance of 204
 - Tribunal’s conclusion 206
- parties’ arguments (claimant) 177–8
 - Centre’s request for clarification 183–4
 - Claimant’s memorial, problems with 185–6
 - Competition Office proceedings 183
 - ETTA levy 182–3
 - failure to designate as universal service provider 182
 - poor presentation/lack of specificity 182, 195–200
 - pricing regime (SMP providers) 183
 - response to respondent’s objections 188–9
- parties’ arguments (respondent) (objections to the jurisdiction) 177–8, 186–8
 - reply to claimant’s answer to objections 189–90
- prima facie* legal case requirement 182, 191–200
- procedural and factual background 175–7
 - constitution of Tribunal 175–6
 - Hungarian Public Telephone Service, reorganization 178–9
 - submissions on costs 177
- relevant legal instruments
 - Hungary–Norway BIT (1991) 179–80
 - Pannon–Hungary concession agreement by article 180–1
 - 2 (scope and duration of agreement) 181
 - 3 (concession fee) 181
 - 6 (Pannon’s obligation) 181
- treaty interpretation
 - certainty of interpretation, need for 204
 - ordinary meaning in absence of counter-indications 204
 - parties’ intentions 204–6
 - treaty interpretation principles vs investor protection policy considerations 204–5
 - treaty practice as aid 204–5
- Tribunal’s award 208
- Tribunal’s conclusions
 - costs 207–8
 - jurisdiction 207
- time-limits (BITs)**, 18 months rule 18–20, 31–9
- time-limits for institution of claim (NAFTA 1116(2) and 1117(2)) (3-year rule)** 448–50
 - continuing wrong 448–50
 - identity of NAFTA 1116(2) and 1117(2) 450
 - jurisprudence
 - Feldman* 449–50
 - Mondev* 449–50
 - UPS* 448–50
- travaux préparatoires as supplementary means of treaty interpretation (VCLT 32)**
 - El Salvador–Spain BIT (1995) 141–4
 - ICSID, 25(2)(b) (“foreign control”) 583–4
 - jurisprudence, *Inceysa* 141–4
 - supplementary nature/use, to avoid manifestly absurd or unreasonable result 580–2

treaties

- compliance/implementation (VCLT 26–7)
 - non-compliance/breach, domestic law as justification (VCLT 27) 426–7
 - obligation of result vs best efforts 464

treaties, interpretation (general considerations)

- aids, State/treaty practice 204–5
- applicable law, VCLT (1969) 33, 572–3
- guidelines
 - certainty, need for 204
 - sovereignty, relevance 66–8

treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(1)) (general rule: good faith, ordinary meaning, context, object and purpose)

- effectiveness (*ut res magis valeat quam pereat*) (*effet utile*) 79
- every element of treaty to be given effect 79

jurisprudence

- Azurix* 573–80
- Methanex* 66–7
- Noble Ventures* 67
- Pan American Energy* 66–8
- SGS v. Philippines* 67
- UPS* 458–9

[natural and] ordinary meaning

- in context 459–62
- “investment” 576
 - “properly constituted” (ICSID 52(1)(a)) 631
 - “investments shall be accorded MFN treatment” 204
 - “regulatory, administrative or other governmental authority” (NAFTA 1502(3)(a)/NAFTA 1503(2)) 464–6

object and purpose, NAFTA 102 453–4

- parties’ intention 138–40, 368
- party’s treaty practice as guide 204–5

treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(2)) (context)

- similar terms in same treaty, clear intent to treat differently 79
- treaty as a whole 145

treaties, interpretation (VCLT 31(3)) (points to be taken into account together with context)

- parties’ subsequent practice establishing agreement concerning interpretation (VCLT 31(3)(b)) 38–9
 - “practice” 38–9
- subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation or application of the treaty (VCLT 31(3)(a)), FTC Interpretative Note (31 July 2001), “agreement” 38

treaties, interpretation (VCLT 32) (supplementary means), manifestly unreasonable or absurd result and (VCLT 32(b)) 580–2**umbrella clause (undertaking to observe domestic commitments)**

- conversion of contract obligations into international obligations and 66–76
 - State as sovereign vs State as merchant considerations 73
- jurisprudence
 - CMS* 700–1

Eureko 70–2
Impregilo 700–1
Joy Machinery 72–3
Methanex 66–7
Pan American Energy 66–76
Plama 700–1
Salini 72
SGS v. Pakistan 65, 68–9, 73–5
SGS v. Philippines 69–70
Vivendi II 72–3

UNCITRAL Arbitration Rules by article, 38–40 (fees and costs) 487–8

UNCITRAL Model Law 1985, public policy and 240

United Kingdom

contract, validity/voidability 246–56: *see also World Duty Free* (Perfume Contract claims)

balancing the public policy burden 252–4

Lord Mustill’s legal opinion (*World Duty Free*) 247

lost, relevance 251–2

public policy, balancing the public policy burden 252–4

unjust enrichment

consent to the jurisdiction and 153

Inceysa 153

UPS (merits)

background

parties 445

procedural history 444

summary of claims 445–7

Canada Post, status as “party” (NAFTA 1102/NAFTA 1105) 455–63

parties’ arguments

claimant 455–8

respondent 455–6, 458

Tribunal’s analysis 458–63

applicability of NAFTA provisions as *lex specialis* (ILC 55) 458–63

empowerment to exercise elements of governmental authority (ILC 5) 462–3, 466–7

costs 487–8

cultural industries exception (NAFTA 2106 and Annex 2016)/Publications Assistance

Program (PAP) 477–85

dissenting opinion 506–18

“like circumstances” (NAFTA 1102) 507–13

parties’ positions

claimant 482

respondent 481

Publications Assistance Program (PAP)

distribution assistance through Canada Post 481

operation 480

public policy function of Canada Post 478–9

subsidization of Canadian publishing industry and 479

Tribunal’s analysis 482–4

“cultural industries”, applicability to delivery mechanism (NAFTA 2017(a)) 482–4

“like circumstances” (NAFTA 1102) 484–5

UPS (merits) (*cont.*)

- Tribunal's conclusion 484–5
- dissenting opinion (Cass) 490–527
- interpretation of NAFTA 453–4
 - ordinary meaning (VCLT 31) 458–9, 464–6
 - in context 459–62
- parties' arguments
 - claimants 453–4
 - respondent 454
- jurisdictional objections (Canada)
 - alleged failure to establish damage (NAFTA 1116(1)) 452
 - assertions (Canada) 447–8
 - objections to the jurisdiction and affirmative defences distinguished 448
 - standing (NAFTA 1116/NAFTA 1117), distinguishability 451
 - time bar (NAFTA 1116(2)) (3-year rule) 448–50
 - continuing wrong 448–50
 - identity of NAFTA 1117(2) provision 450
- MFN treatment (NAFTA 1103)/standard of treatment (NAFTA 1104) (failure to meet burden/standard of proof obligation) 486–7
- minimum standard of treatment (NAFTA 1105) (failure to meet burden/standard of proof obligation) 467–77, 487
 - dissenting opinion 491–505
 - burden of proof 495
 - competitive relationship test 493–5
 - “in like circumstances” (postal vs express consignment/courier services) 495–9, 513–17
 - NAFTA/GATT/GATS provisions compared 500–2
 - public policy considerations as distinguishing factor 499–500
 - “same economic sector” requirement 493
- parties' positions
 - claimant 467–8
 - respondent 469
- Tribunal's analysis 468–74
 - burden of proof 469, 474
 - Kyoto Convention (Revised) (1999) 473–4
 - “in like circumstances” (postal vs express consignment/courier services) 470–4
 - required elements 469
 - “treatment” 469–70
- Tribunal's conclusion 474
- national treatment/“like circumstances” obligation (NAFTA 1102) (Canada's enforcement of customs laws), dissenting opinion, subsidy exception (NAFTA 1108(7)(b)) 505, 517–18
- procurement exception (NAFTA 1108(7)(a)) (Postal Imports Agreement (PIA)) 474–7
 - dissenting opinion 502–5
 - parties' arguments, claimant 476
 - parties' positions, respondent 476
 - PIA provisions 474–6
 - Tribunal's analysis 476–7
 - Tribunal's conclusion 477

- “regulatory, administrative or other governmental authority” (NAFTA 1502(3)(a)/
 NAFTA 1503(2)) claims 463–7
- dissenting opinion 518–27
- parties’ positions
 - claimant 463
 - empowerment to exercise elements of governmental authority (ILC 5) 466–7
 - examples of “government authority” 463–4, 466–7
 - ordinary meaning 464–6
 - purpose of State responsibility provisions 464
 - respondent 463
 - State enterprise (NAFTA 1503) and government monopoly (NAFTA 1502)
 distinguished 464
 - Tribunal’s analysis, “delegation” 464
 - Tribunal’s conclusion 466–7
- Tribunal’s decision 488

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969) by article, 27: *see* treaties,
 compliance/implementation (VCLT 26–7), non-compliance/breach, domestic law
 as justification (VCLT 27)

World Duty Free (Perfume Contract claims)

- applicable law, inconsistency articles 9(2)(c) and 10A of Agreement/reconciliation
 (English principles as part of Kenyan law) 246
- costs, parties’ costs 256
- imputability of bribe 250
- legality of contract (bribery allegation) (parties’ positions) 232–5
 - claimant’s response 233–4
 - respondent’s reply 234–5
 - respondent’s submissions 232–3
- legality of contract (bribery allegation) (Tribunal’s decision) 235–56: *see also* bribery/
 corruption
 - arbitration clause, relevance of bribe 256
 - avoidance, requirements 255–6
 - balancing the public policy burden 252–4
 - consequence of bribe 240–56
 - existence of bribe 236–40
 - bribe vs donation argument 239–40
 - evidence of Mr Ali’s payments to President Moi 236–9
 - head of State immunity as procedural bar 251
 - loss, relevance 251–2
 - parties’ responsibility for protracted proceedings 235–6
 - separability of contract 252
 - under English and Kenyan law (applicable law) 246–56
 - English law (Lord Mustill’s legal opinion) 247
 - Kenyan law (Harambee) 239–40, 250–1
 - under international public policy 240–6
- parties’ submissions on the merits
 - claimant’s request and memorial 225–8
 - respondent’s counter-memorial 228–9
 - claimant’s reply 230

World Duty Free (Perfume Contract claims) (cont.)

- preliminary objections (respondent) 230–2
 - joinder to the merits (AR 41(4)) 231
 - re-registration obligation/Isle of Man High Court proceedings 214–15, 230–1
 - Tribunal’s directions on 214–15
- procedural history 213–25
 - constitution of Tribunal 214
 - extension of time-limits 217
 - Isle of Man High Court proceedings 219–21, 230–2
 - Lord Mustill’s legal opinion 221–2
 - President Daniel arap Moi, position in respect of 213
 - Procedural Order on preliminary issues for determination 222–3
 - provisional measures on confidentiality 215–17
 - resignation of Professor Crawford (AR 8(2)) 215
 - replacement by Mr VV Veeder 215–16
 - request for disqualification of Mr Veeder 222
 - Tribunal’s directions relating to proceedings on objections 214–15
- Tribunal’s conclusions and decision 256–7